REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 9, 2007, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102 – Claim 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by DeFrees-Parrott. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the feature, "wherein the lottery ticket is associated with a player selection of one of a plurality of lotteries." (Emphasis added). At the heart of DeFreez-Parrott, a player of a slot machine is advanced to a bonus lottery game upon an event, *e.g.*, wagering a predetermined number of credits (DeFreez-Parrott, p. 2, ¶¶ [0039] – [0044]). In short, DeFreez-Parrott provides only a single lottery game in response to a slot machine win—*no player selection amongst a plurality of lotteries*. Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over DeFrees-Parrott because it does not teach, suggest, or disclose, either expressly or inherently, "wherein the lottery ticket is associated with a player selection of one of a plurality of lotteries."

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

2. Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claims 2 and 3

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeFrees-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 2 has been amended to include the feature, "wherein the lottery ticket is associated with a player selection of one of a plurality of lotteries." Akin to the rationale set forth in Section 1, DeFreez-Parrott does not teach, suggest, or disclose this feature, either expressly or inherently. Furthermore, Okuniewicz's invention is directed to "dispensing of lottery entries in response to particular reel combinations or particular events occurring on the slot machine board environment." (Okuniewicz, p. 1, ¶ [0007]; see also p. 2, ¶ [0015]).

Okuniewicz, too, is limited to entry into a single lottery game. Thus, claim 2 is patentable over DeFreeze-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz because they do not teach, suggest, or disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed limitation, "wherein the lottery ticket is associated with a player selection of one of a plurality of lotteries."

Claim 3 is patentable over DeFreeze-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 2. Plus, claim 3 includes additional features, that, in combination with independent claim 2, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn.

3. New Claims 7-16

Independent claim 7 includes the feature, "providing a choice of one of a plurality of lotteries from which the purchase is to be made if the primary wager results in winning the primary prize." Consistent with the rationale set forth in Sections 1 and 2, neither DeFreez-Parrott nor Okuniewicz teach, suggest, or disclose this feature, either expressly or inherently.

Claims 8-10 are patentable over DeFreeze-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 7. Furthermore, claims 8-10 include additional features, that, in combination with independent claim 7, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Claims 11-13 are patentable over DeFreeze-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Furthermore, claims 11-13 include additional features, that, in combination with independent claim 1, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Claims 14-16 are patentable over DeFreeze-Parrott in view of Okuniewicz at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 2. Furthermore, claims 14-16 include additional features, that, in combination with independent claim 2, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-3 and 7-16 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fees indicated in the Fee Transmittal, any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 194293, Deposit Account Name STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 734-3246. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2007

Joel G. Landau
Reg. No. 54,732
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
2121 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel 310.734.3200
Fax 310.734.3300